

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 5, 2008.

Claims 1, 12, 15, 16 and 24 are amended, claims 2 and 14 are canceled; as a result, claims 1, 3-13 and 15-31 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

The Final office action rejects claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) over Katsavounidis et al. (U.S. 6,876,705). Applicants do not admit that the Katsavounidis patent is prior art to the present invention and reserves the right to swear behind this patent at a later date. Nonetheless, Applicants believe the claims of the present invention are distinguishable over this reference.

In column 8, lines 40-48, Katsavounidis describes “the process conceals the error in the missing macroblock by linearly interpolating data from an upper macroblock that is intended to be displayed “**above**” the missing macroblock in the image, and from a lower macroblock that is intended to be displayed “**below**” the missing macroblock in the image.

In contrast, amended independent claim 1 and independent claims 17, 26 and 29 recite “estimating the damaged macroblock by using undamaged macroblocks substantially **surrounding** a boundary of the damaged macroblock in the video frame and replacing the damaged macroblock with the estimated damaged macroblock to conceal the error in the damaged macroblock”. Support for this can be found in page 6, lines 14-24 and Figure 3 of the specification.

Also, Katsavounidis **fails** to teach or suggest “estimating a pixel value for each pixel in the damaged macroblock by computing a weighted sum of the associated pixel values in each of the undamaged macroblocks **surrounding** the damaged macroblock”, as recited in the independent claims 6 and 21.

Further, Katsavounidis **does not** disclose “estimating a motion vector of a macroblock located substantially **adjacent and above** the damaged macroblock, estimating a motion vector of a macroblock located substantially **below** the damaged macroblock and estimating a motion vector of a macroblock located substantially **adjacent, above, and left** of the damaged

macroblock”, as recited in amended independent claims 12 and 24. For the above reasons, independent claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21 24, 26, and 29 should be found allowable.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 13, 15-16, 18-20, 22-23, 25, 27-28 and 30-31 depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 24, 26 and 29, respectively, so they should be allowable for the reasons presented above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 1, 3-13 and 15-31 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

ARVIND RAMAN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Global IP Services, PLLC,
198 F, 27th Cross, 3rd Block,
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011
INDIA

Phone: 603-888-7958



Date October 31, 2008

By _____

Prakash Nama
Reg. No. 44,255